



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,333	03/28/2001	Pavitra Subramaniam	005306.P026	3135

7590

12/03/2004

Dennis M. de Guzman  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
Seventh Floor  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/820,333	SUBRAMANIAM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Mylinh T Tran	2179	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                         |                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                             | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's Amendment filed 06/17/04 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1, 11 and 15 have been amended. However, limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record, therefore, claims 1-21 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed 03/15/04.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, 14-15 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarkar [US. 6,012,067].

As to claims 1, 11 and 15, Sarkar discloses loading a definition associated with a logical structure (relational database, column 5, lines 37-47); associating components of the logical structure to an intermediate unit (tables, column 8, lines 58-65 and column 9, lines 32-35), the components of the logical structure comprising a set of questions to be presented to a user (column 5, lines 58-67, "SQL queries uniformly manipulate disparate relational data and other complex web objects...Present invention uses URLs as locators for remote database objects and SQL queries uniformly manipulate local and /or remote database

table, attributes and objects. A different paradigm for SQL query execution over multiple relational databases on the web is presented"; based at least in part on the loaded definition, executing the logical structure to determine a presentation sequence (Figure 3, tables R, S, T) of the components associated to the intermediate unit (column 9, lines 30-46); and generating a file, which represents the presentation sequence of a network to allow presentation of the component, to transmit across as part of a user interface on a client terminal (column 9, lines 9-14).

As to claim 2, Sarkar also discloses the logical structure is usable for a customer relationship management system (column 5, lines 14, 18).

As to claim 6, Sarkar teaches the intermediate unit comprising a logical entity having a virtual table, the virtual table capably associating portions of the loaded definition to a single structure (column 4, lines 3-10).

As to claim 7, Sarkar also teaches executing the logical structure to determine the presentation sequence of the components includes using a function call to read the loaded script definition (column 9, line 47 through column 10, line 6).

As to claim 8, Sarkar shows the generated file comprising a hypertext markup language (HTML) file (column 10, lines 46-55).

As to claims 10, 14 and 18, Sarkar also shows providing a first user interface component different from a second user interface component that generates the file to transmit across the network (column 5, lines 48-67, the first user interface (table) has different component than the second user interface (table)); and

Art Unit: 2179

using an element of the first user interface component to interact with the intermediate component to present the sequence at the first user interface component or to allow other manipulation related to the executed logical structure (column 11, lines 42-57).

As to claim 19, Sarkar provides the storage location comprising a database, the database having tables from which the definition is loaded by the loader (column 3, lines 47-61).

As to claim 20, Sarkar also provides the storage location comprising a file system, the file system capable to store a definition file having the definition, the loader capable to load the definition file stored in the file system (column 4, lines 57-63).

As to claim 21, Sarkar suggests the definition comprising a plurality of elements compiled into a single block of data stored in the storage location (column 3, lines 47-61, data in each table is stored into a single block).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5, 9, 12-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkar in view of Kingberg et al. [5,734,887].

As to claims 3, 4 and 12, the difference between Sarkar and the claim is question and answer tables. Although Sarkar shows relationship between two tables, it does not clearly shows the relationship between question and answer tables. On the other hand, Kingberg et al. teaches the two tables at figures 7 and 8A, column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sarkar and Kingberg et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify relational database taught by Sarkar to include the two specific relationship between question and answer tables of Kingberg et al., with the motivation being to satisfy a query structure as taught by Kingberg.

As to claim 5, Kingberg et al. also discloses the components of the logical structure including questions (column 7, lines 27-36).

As to claims 9, 13 and 17, Kingberg et al. teaches executing the logical structure to determine the presentation sequence of the components includes interacting with a set of rules at the intermediate unit to determine a number of components, including questions at branches of the logical structure, to present on the client terminal (column 16, lines 7-23).

As to claim 16, Kingberg et al. also teaches an answer table or database table linked to the execution unit to store answers received from the client terminal in response to the presentation of the components, wherein presentation components of the logical structure is further based at least in part on the received answers (column 7, lines 27-36).

### **Response to Arguments**

Applicant argues the prior arts do not teach or suggest "a logical structure whose components include a set of questions to be presented to a user". However, the argument is not persuasive. Sarkar teaches the feature at column 5, lines 58-67, see the cited lines "SQL queries uniformly manipulate disparate relational data and other complex web objects...Present invention uses URLs as locators for remote database objects and SQL queries uniformly manipulate local and /or remote database table, attributes and objects. A different paradigm for SQL query execution over multiple relational databases on the web is presented".

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2179

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4141. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (571) 272-4136.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

BA HUYNH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER